United Nations A/60/PV.66

General Assembly

Sixtieth session

Official Records

66th plenary meeting
Tuesday, 20 December 2005, 10 a.m.
New York

President: Mr. Eliasson ..... (Sweden)

The meeting was called to order at 11.15 a.m.

Agenda items 46 and 120 (*continued*)

Integrated and coordinated implementation of and follow-up to the outcomes of the major United Nations conferences and summits in the economic, social and related fields

Follow-up to the outcome of the Millennium Summit

Draft resolution A/60/L.40

The President: I regret the delay in calling the meeting to order; it was not caused by the transit strike here in New York. I hope that the delay will have a consensus-building effect.

The report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/60/L.40 is contained in document A/60/598, which is being circulated in the Hall. I would like to express my appreciation to the Fifth Committee for its expeditious handling of that issue.

I understand that there are a number of translation errors in some language versions of draft resolution A/60/L.40. Delegations are invited to submit corrections to the President's Office so that they can be reflected in the final version of the resolution.

We are assembled here this morning to consider draft resolution A/60/L.40, on the Peacebuilding Commission, which was first presented to members at an informal meeting on 14 December. I am sure that, since then, all members will have had an opportunity to study the draft resolution carefully and to consult among themselves. Many representatives have approached me and my Office over the past few days about the text. I shall make some comments on the text in a moment. But first, I want to reflect on what we are all, I hope, on the verge of doing.

I believe that the adoption of the draft resolution today would be truly historic. That word — "historic" — is often overused, but in this case I have no doubt that it is merited. Why? Because the draft resolution would, for the first time in the history of the United Nations, create a mechanism ensuring that for countries emerging from conflict the term "post-conflict" would not mean post-engagement of the international community. It would be our best chance to reverse the trend which we have seen around the world in recent years, where half of the countries emerging from conflict are lapsing back into it again within five years. It would help to bring an end to the pattern of conflicts erupting again simply because support for the healing process was not there when it was needed.

As members know, I have often recalled the need to bring realities into these halls over the past three and a half months. One reality is the real problems — the conflict, the poverty, the hunger; another reality is the expectations, dreams and aspirations of the peoples of the world regarding what this Organization should be. I am sure that all members agree that, with the

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

05-65656 (E)

Peacebuilding Commission, we will have a real chance to make a difference for the better in years to come for a great number of men, women and children in conflict-stricken countries.

So whom do we have to thank for getting us to the point of having this draft resolution before us? First, we have to thank those countries and individuals that came up with the idea and, of course, the Secretary-General, who first elaborated and articulated the concept of a Peacebuilding Commission.

Secondly, we have to thank our leaders for giving us such clear direction in the 2005 World Summit Outcome (resolution 60/1). They decided to establish a Peacebuilding Commission and stipulated that it should begin its work no later than 31 December 2005: 11 days from now. The draft resolution rightly reaffirms that outcome document decision.

Thirdly, we again thank the two co-Chairs of the informal consultations, Ambassador Løj of Denmark and Ambassador Mahiga of the United Republic of Tanzania, supported by their staffs and my staff, for conducting our negotiations with such commitment and such efficiency.

But fourthly, and most important, I want to thank all of you, the members of the General Assembly. You have devoted a great amount of energy and have shown deep dedication to this task during an intense period of work for all of us. You have worked closely with the co-Chairs; you have given them your comments and proposals; you have engaged constructively in negotiations. This draft resolution is, I hope, something that every single member of the General Assembly will recognize as a ground-breaking achievement.

Now, I will turn to my comments on the text. My first observation, colleagues, is that none of you — I repeat, none of you — have got everything you wanted in this draft resolution. For some, adopting it would mean compromising on some points on which you had felt, and still feel, strongly. A number of you asked whether the language of the draft resolution could be changed to accommodate your concerns. To do so would have meant opening up the document to a further round of lengthy and complicated negotiations, without necessarily leading to a better result.

Many of you have commented on the roles of the various organs and other parts of the United Nations family in regard to the Peacebuilding Commission. This is an important question. The establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission is intended to create a new dynamic, bringing together the broad experience of the United Nations spanning conflict prevention, mediation, peacekeeping, respect for human rights, the rule of law, humanitarian assistance, reconstruction and long-term development. Such varied activities, and the global legitimacy of the United Nations, make the Organization uniquely positioned to take a leading role in peacebuilding. We need to make sure that the Commission can draw upon all the experience the United Nations system has to offer and mobilize support from others — such as the World Bank and so forth, which are part of our project — so that in the end this Commission passes the necessary field test. It must work out there in the field; that is how we shall test the success of the Commission.

The draft resolution sets out how the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council should work in peacebuilding. The Peacebuilding Commission will be an advisory subsidiary organ of the General Assembly and the Security Council, the first such body of its kind. The General Assembly will have an overall responsibility to review the work of the Peacebuilding Commission through debating its annual report.

Most of the countries emerging from conflict are on the agenda of the Security Council. The Peacebuilding Commission will hence have an important role in giving advice to the Security Council for the early planning and commencement of peacebuilding activities.

And the Peacebuilding Commission must work with the Economic and Social Council to ensure that the international community and donors do not lose interest in a country once it is no longer making headlines.

The Economic and Social Council will be a principal organ for policy dialogue and coordination on issues of economic and social development and will promote assistance as countries move from recovery towards long-term development. In that context, I once again stress the importance of a reformed Economic and Social Council playing its rightful part in peacebuilding — and in the work of the Peacebuilding Commission, of course. In this regard, I hope to see the fruits of the Assembly's labours in the informal consultations dealing with Economic and Social

Council reform very shortly after we return in the New Year.

These three organs will all be able to put countries on the agenda of the Peacebuilding Commission in accordance with their respective mandates in the Charter. Equally, I must stress that it will be possible for individual Member States on the verge of lapsing or relapsing into conflict to turn to the Peacebuilding Commission for advice. Our goal for the Peacebuilding Commission must be to decrease the number of countries falling back into conflict.

Another point on which a number of members have had had concerns is the composition of the Organizational Committee, on which difficult, even painful, choices had to be made. On this matter, it is important to emphasize the extent to which much of the important substantive work of the Peacebuilding Commission will be done in its country-specific settings. We will have to make every effort to organize the work of the country-specific meetings in a manner conducive to effective action. The draft resolution leaves open how many members of the Organizational Committee will participate alongside others in these meetings.

With regard to the selection of the members of the Organizational Committee itself, the draft resolution sets out that every organ or group will select or elect its own members. The Security Council and the Economic and Social Council will first choose the members they wish to be appointed. Then, the top 10 donors and top 10 troop-contributing countries will each select five members that have not already been chosen by the Security Council or the Economic and Social Council. Finally, in order to have balanced representation from all regional groups, and thus to ensure legitimacy, the General Assembly will elect seven additional members.

As the draft resolution sets out, members of the Organizational Committee shall serve for renewable terms of two years, as applicable. At two-year intervals, the lists of donors and troop contributors will be updated. Existing members would need to remain on the updated lists in order for a renewal of their term to be considered. This will serve as an incentive for Member States to strive for maintained and increased contributions to the United Nations.

Lastly, some members have asked about the nature of the participation of the international financial institutions, regional organizations and United Nations representatives in the Peacebuilding Commission. As members know, the draft resolution states that they will be included as members in the work of the country-specific meetings of the Commission. Given that the Peacebuilding Commission will be an intergovernmental body, these institutions, organizations and representatives will obviously participate in an observer capacity.

In closing, colleagues, I want to reiterate my sincere hope that this text will meet with your approval. As I said last week, I believe your important contributions throughout the negotiation process have made this key issue of the outcome document ripe for decision. You have worked so hard for this. A decision today with the broadest possible agreement would send a positive message that our intergovernmental work is producing results. We have an opportunity today to prove ourselves and to prove the relevance of the United Nations in dealing with the problems of the world.

Let us show our leaders, our peoples, our civil society and our media, and most of all let us show all those people who are seeking to cast off the dark shadow of conflict, what the General Assembly can do in support and in solidarity.

We shall now proceed to consider draft resolution A/60/L.40. Before giving the floor to the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, who wishes to speak in explanation of position, may I remind delegations that explanations of vote or position are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mrs. Núñez de Ouremán (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) *(spoke in Spanish)*: After having participated in laborious and difficult debates on this subject, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela wishes to express its total disagreement with draft resolution A/60/L.40, which creates the Peacebuilding Commission, the foundations and content of which threaten the attributes and powers of the General Assembly and the cardinal principle of the self-determination of peoples as recognized in the United Nations Charter.

In the first place, the draft resolution supposedly is based on and implements the outcome document of the 2005 summit (resolution 60/1), which was the result of secret negotiations conducted behind closed

doors, from which more than 170 countries, in the best of cases, were excluded. Fundamental elements, such as the exclusively advisory nature of the Commission and the central role of the State and of the people affected by an internal conflict, were disregarded in the text that resulted from this confabulation.

As one of the facilitators rightly said, by the time of the last stage of negotiations in August and September 2005, the differences on the Commission had become so significant that there was no possibility of consensus. That is why, in the final stage of negotiations, the President of the Assembly restricted the negotiations in an authoritarian and arbitrary manner to a few States that illegally assumed representation of the General Assembly and arrived at the allegedly agreed text known as the outcome document, which the Republic considered and considers to be null, invalid and devoid of any political or legal effect.

Second, the term "conflict prevention" is introduced in the fifteenth preambular paragraph. That term has not been defined in content or scope, with the apparent purpose of broadening the objective and purpose of the Commission, for no known reason. That represents yet another manoeuvre by the big Powers and their allies to legitimize intervention by States at any time.

Third, the ninth preambular paragraph makes it the responsibility of States emerging from conflict to identify their priorities and strategies for post-conflict peacebuilding. However, that conflicts with operative paragraphs 7 (a), 10 and 22, which attribute only a secondary role to affected States in the peacebuilding process. Furthermore, in spite of a few references in the draft resolution to the advisory and intergovernmental nature of the Commission, its structure, membership and functions make it a supra-national decision-making body that makes empty rhetoric of the affirmation that the Commission is advisory and intergovernmental. That flouts the sovereign power of a State in a post-conflict situation freely to choose its own model for reconstruction and development, in accordance with its right to self-determination.

Fourth, we also wish to express our disagreement that the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund should be invited as permanent participants in all meetings of the Peacebuilding Commission. The functions of those bodies should be limited to participation in the financial assistance requested of them by States in a post-conflict situation for the development of their peacebuilding process. Moreover, the presence of those institutions runs counter to the intergovernmental nature accorded to the Commission.

Fifth, operative paragraphs 1, 4, 12 and 16 allude to the Security Council as the main decision-making body of the Commission. That conflicts with the Commission's advisory nature. We all know the scope of the powers with which the Charter endows the Security Council, just as we know of those additional powers that the Council has assumed in peacekeeping operations beyond its purview, usurping the authority of the General Assembly.

Sixth, we note that operative paragraph 3 gives ambiguous discretion to the Peacebuilding Commission, which will lead to conflicts of competence or of interest.

Seventh, the Commission's organizational committee, in addition to being a contraband item slipped in the course of the spurious negotiations that led to the outcome document of the 2005 summit, is unequal and unfair in the composition of its membership. Of the 15 members of the Security Council, seven will be selected, while seven of the 54 members of the Economic and Social Council will be selected, taking into account countries with experience in post-conflict situations. Lastly, of the 191 States members of the General Assembly, only seven will be elected to the Commission, so long as they have experience in post-conflict situations. That is unacceptable to Venezuela, as it reduces the representation of the General Assembly on the Commission to an inadequate minimum and accords membership to States that have been and continue to be victims of acts of intervention by the big Powers through the Security Council. The will to self-determination of such States has thereby been seriously diminished and they can therefore do poor service to countries in post-conflict situations. In addition to the unequal and unfair composition of the membership to which we have referred, we note that this situation also applies to the fact that Security Council members and States that bear the costs or contribute troops and civil police will be admitted to the organizational committee by selection, while the members of the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly will be

subject to election. A democratic process is needed in that regard.

Eighth, the Republic, having accepted the outcome document of the September summit as a simple working paper, requested that the Commission's organizational committee exclude States and national or international financial entities, private enterprises and military institutions that had been or are in some way involved in a given conflict situation. Our proposal, which was rejected, was based on the fact that, if peace is to be built, it is necessary, inter alia, not to allow those agents to participate in the Commission that have been involved in any way in a conflict, either causing, fuelling, encouraging or aggravating it. It is therefore inconceivable to endow those that have acted in such a manner with the power to decide or influence the fate of States and peoples in a post-conflict situation.

As a result of all this, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, as a sovereign country and full-fledged member of an exclusively intergovernmental organization — the United Nations — declares that the Peacebuilding Commission that this draft resolution purports to create — and which, as such, has only the power of recommendation — is not and will not be recognized as a valid and legitimate organ of the United Nations by our Republic. Given that its establishment and functions contravene the United Nations Charter, we will recognize none of its actions and opinions. We therefore disassociate ourselves from the draft resolution. It should also be clear that, for consensus to exist, there must be unanimity on the part of all members of the General Assembly. There is no unanimity on this draft resolution, and therefore no consensus.

In conclusion, we warn yet again that, with this draft resolution, what is being created is an institutional mechanism of intervention by States through a perverted and bogus multilateralism serving the will of the Government of the United States of America and its allies. Furthermore, the United Nations is turning its back on the peoples of the world. Sooner or later, history will judge those responsible for this unconscionable outrage, which will help only to further aggravate the profound inequality and injustice that prevail in the United Nations and in the world today.

The President: The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/60/L.40, entitled "The Peacebuilding Commission".

May I take it that the Assembly decides to adopt draft resolution A/60/L.40?

Draft resolution A/60/L.40 was adopted (resolution 60/180).

The President: I now call on the Secretary-General.

The Secretary-General: I am delighted that the General Assembly has now agreed in detail on how to implement the world summit decision to establish a Peacebuilding Commission.

That achievement marks a turning point in our efforts to help States and societies manage the difficult transition from war to peace. Following last week's creation of a revitalized Central Emergency Response Fund, today's measure marks another important step towards the renewed United Nations envisioned in my report "In larger freedom" and mandated by the outcome document of the world summit.

The work of the United Nations to build peace has intensified in recent years as the complexity and scope of post-conflict challenges have increased. We have worked to provide humanitarian assistance and to better link emergency aid to longer-term reconstruction and recovery efforts. In East Timor and Kosovo, we have even had to assume responsibilities normally undertaken by Governments.

That work has not been easy. Indeed, our hard-won successes have been tempered by some sad failures, but we have learned from our mistakes and improved our capacity.

Yet, until now, a critical institutional gap persisted. For while many parts of the United Nations have been involved in the peacebuilding process, the system has lacked a dedicated entity to oversee the process, ensure its coherence or sustain it through the long haul. That resulted in fractured peacebuilding operations, with no single forum for all the relevant actors to come together, share information and develop a common strategy. Too often, a fragile peace has been allowed to crumble into renewed conflict.

Today's General Assembly resolution goes a long way towards bridging that gap. The Peacebuilding Commission will help countries make the transition

from war to peace. It will advise on recovery. It will focus attention on reconstruction and institution-building. It will improve coordination both within and beyond the United Nations system. It will develop best practices and ensure predictable funding. Perhaps most important of all, it will liaise with the international community to keep us all engaged in the long-term recovery effort.

The establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission is a historic measure, as we heard our President say earlier on, but it must be a beginning, not an end. If we are to ensure that the Commission functions properly, if it is truly to make a difference — not in these halls, but in the countries where its help is needed — we must take the utmost care when establishing country-specific groups. We must make sure that, for every conflict, those groups reflect the views and voices of the main stakeholders. We must also see to it that the Commission is adequately supported by a new peacebuilding support office. That office, to be based within the Secretariat, will provide the Commission with the information and analysis it needs to coordinate the United Nations peacebuilding efforts.

In short, it is vital that the momentum of this reform be sustained. But right now, we have real reason to be satisfied.

Let me congratulate the General Assembly on today's historic vote. Let me thank especially President Eliasson and the co-Chairs of the informal discussion, the Permanent Representatives of Denmark and Tanzania, as well as their staffs and the Permanent Representatives here in the General Assembly and their staffs, for their hard work over these past weeks and months.

The President: I now call on those delegations that wish to speak in explanation of position. May I remind delegations that explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. Bolton (United States of America): The United States was pleased to support the concurrent resolutions in the Security Council and the General Assembly which have now established the Peacebuilding Commission that our heads of State and Government committed to at the September summit. We congratulate the Permanent Representatives of Denmark and Tanzania and the President of the General Assembly on their tireless work on those resolutions.

We must now turn our attention to seeing to it that the Commission in fact realizes its potential to make an important contribution to the work of the Security Council to build sustainable peace in the aftermath of immediate threats to international peace and security. The resolutions emphasize that the Commission must take into account the primary responsibility of the Security Council under the Charter for the maintenance of international peace and security, which would include the Council's role in the coordination of efforts to maintain peace and security on the ground.

Our common imperative is to create a cost-effective, efficient advisory institution capable of ensuring the successful transition from peacekeeping operations to peacebuilding, providing important advice but not duplicating work. The Peacebuilding Commission can most effectively help prevent nations from sliding back into conflict by ensuring that the Security Council is aware of all the elements that are essential to achieving sustainable peace in a given nation, from immediate humanitarian assistance to transitional security to national efforts at institution-building. That will assist the Security Council as it develops the United Nations mandate for the countries under consideration or oversees the implementation of the mandate already in place. Meeting in country-specific working groups, the Commission should advise the Council on facilitating the coordination of international efforts in post-conflict settings, both within and without the United Nations system.

We underline that the resolutions provide that, with respect to matters being considered by the Security Council, the Peacebuilding Commission's main purpose will be to provide advice at the Council's request. The authority of the Security Council to decide whether and when the Commission should be asked to address such matters is important to ensure that the Council can effectively exercise its primary responsibility under the Charter for the maintenance of international peace and security. That is also necessary for the Peacebuilding Commission to be effective. In light of that main purpose of the Commission, we expect that its Organizational Committee will include on the Commission's agenda any such matter requested by the Security Council.

We also note that the resolutions provide that the Peacebuilding Commission shall meet in various configurations and shall act in all matters on the basis of consensus of its members. That consensus requirement applies to all of the various configurations in which the Commission may meet, including, for example, to the Organizational Committee and to country-specific meetings. It also applies to all matters, including any decisions on matters to be considered by the Commission or advice the Commission provides.

We stress that paragraph 27 of the resolutions provides that a review of the Peacebuilding Commission's arrangements after five years, and any changes resulting from such a review, will be decided under the same procedures referred to in paragraph 1 of the resolutions. The need for approval by both the Security Council and the General Assembly of any changes in the Commission's governing arrangements is, of course, inherent in the manner in which the Commission is being created and is not limited to changes resulting from the five-year review that is mentioned specifically in paragraphs 27. The five-year review will offer an important opportunity to determine whether the Commission is working well, needs revision or is not meeting its intended purpose.

Progress on the Peacebuilding Commission reminds us of the urgency of broader institutional reform regarding the United Nations budget. We have a collective interest in ensuring that reforms required to reduce costs and waste across the board are successful.

Mr. Abdelaziz (Egypt): The delegation of Egypt would never have accepted or gone along with resolution 60/180 on the operationalization of the Peacebuilding Commission were it not for our deep sense of belonging to Africa and our conviction that millions of Africans in countries emerging from or relapsing into conflict are hopeful that the Peacebuilding Commission will be operationalized at the earliest possible date. The peoples of Africa are looking forward to a dedicated mechanism aimed at mobilizing and coordinating international and regional efforts to assist countries emerging from conflict to rebuild and rehabilitate their national institutions and human capacity towards reconstruction and sustainable development.

It is in this context that my delegation wishes to register the following reservations on the aforementioned resolution. First of all, the resolution lays down a central and authoritative role for the Security Council vis-à-vis the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council in addressing post-conflict peacebuilding. This tendency was clearly reflected in the inclusion of certain references to, and selective and out-of-context utilization of, some provisions of the United Nations Charter, particularly Articles 12 and 27. The delegation of Egypt wishes to stress its disagreement with any legal, political or institutional implications resulting from any misinterpretation of such provisions of this resolution in contravention of the letter and the spirit of the Charter.

Secondly, the primary focus on reinforcement of the scope of the Security Council's authority in driving the work of the Peacebuilding Commission has overshadowed the vital role and the sovereign right of the country concerned that is emerging from conflict, or relapsing into it, to directly seek the advice of the Peacebuilding Commission. This omission is also a flagrant contravention of the principle of national ownership of peacebuilding activities and holds the national priorities of the country concerned, and its ability to activate and terminate such activities, hostage to the prerogatives of the Security Council and the political considerations characterizing the decision-making process in the Council.

Thirdly, the concurrent action by the General Assembly and the Security Council is setting an institutional precedent that is difficult to comprehend, unless its primary objective is to redefine the roles and mandates of the principal organs of the United Nations in a manner that will provide the Security Council with absolute powers. Among such powers is delimiting the role of the General Assembly during the review process in five years by mandating the adoption of concurrent resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. This is a very dangerous precedent, particularly as it does not include providing the General Assembly with the same power to share, on an equal footing, in any decision taken by the Security Council on any matter under its consideration.

Fourthly, although we highly value and appreciate the role of donor countries and institutions in supporting development and reconstruction efforts in countries emerging from conflict, we consider that the resolution deepens the prerogatives of donor countries and institutions outside the scope of the multilateral system in a manner that should have been addressed

directly between the donor countries and the country concerned outside the framework of the United Nations, thus sparing us the establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission as an institutional mechanism bringing together all the relevant organs responsible for security and economic and social development within the United Nations system.

While taking into account such reservations, my delegation joined in the adoption of resolution 60/180 without a vote, in view of the time frame agreed by our heads of State or Government in the 2005 World Summit Outcome (resolution 60/1).

Mr. Stagno Ugarte (Costa Rica) (*spoke in Spanish*): In considering the resolution on the Peacebuilding Commission (resolution 60/180), I would like to reiterate our position on the legal nature of the decision that we are taking today. For Costa Rica, there is no doubt whatsoever that the Peacebuilding Commission was established on 16 September by General Assembly resolution 60/1. The decision to establish the Peacebuilding Commission was effectively taken in paragraph 97 of that resolution, the outcome document of the High-level Plenary Meeting, in which heads of State or Government decided "to establish a Peacebuilding Commission as an intergovernmental advisory body".

In this context, both the resolution that the General Assembly has just adopted and the text adopted concurrently by the Security Council confine themselves to operationalizing a decision that was already adopted in the General Assembly by our heads of State or Government. Thus, we are now merely implementing certain organizational aspects of a substantive decision that had already been taken.

Nonetheless, in spite of the extremely clear legal situation which we are in, the text before us lends itself to misinterpretation. Operative paragraph 1 gives the mistaken impression that we are establishing the Peacebuilding Commission today, when that is not the case. This error could have grave legal and political consequences and represents a threat to the integrity and authority of the General Assembly.

If we wrongly assume that the Peacebuilding Commission is being established today by concurrent action of the General Assembly and the Security Council, we would be submitting an organ created by the General Assembly to the prerogative of the veto. It is particularly inadmissible that, in accordance with paragraph 27 of the resolution, any amendment to the structure or the mandate of the Commission would be subject to veto by the permanent members of the Security Council.

During the negotiations, both in informal consultations and in bilateral meetings, my delegation underscored these dangers. We indicated that, since the Peacebuilding Commission has already been established, the decision we are adopting today is purely procedural in nature and, therefore, cannot be subject to veto. The best legal doctrine and prior decisions of the General Assembly support our legal position. Professor Bruno Simma, in his recognized *The Charter of the United Nations: A Commentary*, affirms unequivocally that

(*spoke in English*)

"the establishment of a subsidiary organ, as well as the appointment of its members, constitutes a procedural question", that "Article 27 proceeds from the distinction between procedural matters based on Chapter V and substantive decisions in accordance with Chapters VI and VII", and that "Articles 28 to 32 must be seen as a non-exhaustive enumeration of procedural questions".

(*spoke in Spanish*)

Furthermore, General Assembly resolution 267 (III), adopted on 14 April 1949, recommends that the Security Council consider the creation of new subsidiary organs as a procedural matter.

In spite of the strength of our reasoning, during the negotiations we faced the customary resistance from those who defend their privileges. Despite the procedural nature of the decision we are adopting, the permanent members of the Security Council, with a view to maintaining and extending the veto, insisted that the General Assembly change the legal reality of the decision. In this way, we are embarking on a dangerous precedent that has the following consequences.

First, we are blurring the already somewhat unclear borders between paragraphs 2 and 3 of Article 27 and, in a more general way, between Chapter V and Chapters VI and VII of the Charter.

Secondly, we are allowing the veto to enter the General Assembly by the back door, since any of the Council's permanent members could veto the review

contemplated in operative paragraph 27 of the resolution.

Thirdly, we are allowing the permanent members to gain a stronger hand in future subsidiary organs in joint relationship with the Security Council.

And, fourthly, we are weakening the unique prerogatives of the General Assembly under Article 10 of the Charter.

It would have been easy to avoid that situation. It would have been sufficient to indicate that the Security Council was acting in accordance with paragraph 2 of Article 27 of the Charter or to have amended paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/60/L.40 to indicate clearly that the resolution was confined to operationalizing the decision taken by our heads of State or Government. Regrettably, our proposals were not accepted.

Our sole purpose was to try to defend the few powers that the General Assembly processes. We seek only to ensure respect for the delicate balance of power between the Security Council and the General Assembly, as established by the Charter and on which the stability of the Organization depends. We did not wish to exacerbate the already uncomfortable relationship between those two organs. Unfortunately, because of the demands of a few, we have not been able to take the right decision. We fear that the price to be paid will be too high.

In conclusion, my delegation wishes to put on record its formal objection to any attempt to apply the provisions of paragraph 3 of Article 27 concerning the veto to the review of the Peacebuilding Commission.

Sir Emyr Jones Parry (United Kingdom): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union.

Today is a historic day. We have reached final agreement on the Peacebuilding Commission — in the Assembly without a vote, and unanimously in the Security Council — and in doing so have achieved the first major milestone of the summit follow-up process.

We should all be proud of this success. Each of us has worked hard over the past several months to find this agreement. Each of us has had to make concessions. Each of us has had to find creative solutions to difficult issues. But no one has worked harder than you and your team, Mr. President, and our colleagues Ambassador Løj and Ambassador Mahiga and their teams. Without your collective efforts — your diplomacy, patience and willingness to listen to all concerns — we would not be here today. Nor would we be here without the cooperation of members of the Assembly. The credit lies with you and with all of us. May I also say, Sir, that we have taken note of, and welcome, what you said in your statement on the issue this morning.

We have established the Peacebuilding Commission so as to make a difference. As it starts its work, that must surely be the objective of all who serve on the Commission. The European Union has strongly supported the concept of the Peacebuilding Commission throughout this process. It remains our hope and our expectation that the Peacebuilding Commission will change things for the better for people in war-torn societies.

With an effective Peacebuilding Commission in place, the United Nations will be better able to help some of the most vulnerable countries on Earth. That is an achievement worthy of this summit and anniversary year. We congratulate you, Sir, and the co-Chairs of the informal consultations for helping us to accomplish that goal today.

Mr. Sen (India): By adopting the resolution on the Peacebuilding Commission, we are implementing the decision taken by our heads of State or Government in September and meeting the deadline set out in the outcome document (*resolution 60/1*).

We compliment you, Mr. President, for your efforts, and the co-Chairs of the informal consultations, the representatives of Tanzania and Denmark, for their efforts. There are certainly improvements in the text, including on the inclusion of the General Assembly as a category with respect to membership of the Organizational Committee — although not in adequate measure by a long chalk. We joined the consensus in creating a body which is of direct interest and of direct use to African and many other developing countries, and which fills a much-needed gap in the post-conflict peacebuilding efforts of the United Nations.

As you said, Mr. President, this is a historic occasion. But it would have been even more momentous if the resolution had correctly reflected what was agreed at the High-level Plenary Meeting of the General Assembly in September. Paragraph 97 of the outcome document states that the leaders agree "to establish a Peacebuilding Commission as an intergovernmental advisory body". In contrast,

paragraph 1 of today's resolution states that it is being established in accordance with Articles 7, 22 and 29 of the Charter of the United Nations. The operationalization of the Peacebuilding Commission as a body subsidiary to both the General Assembly and the Security Council could give the Peacebuilding Commission a dual character in its organization and logical inconsistency in its working.

I shall stick to the functional and political aspects and leave aside the legal aspects, since my good friend the Permanent Representative of Costa Rica has already dealt with them adequately and very well.

The main purposes of the Peacebuilding Commission are delineated in paragraph 98 of the outcome document and are reflected in paragraph 2 of resolution 60/180. However, paragraph 16 of the resolution circumscribes the main purposes of the Commission. It underlines that in post-conflict situations on the agenda of the Security Council of which it is actively seized, the main purpose of the Commission will be to provide advice to the Council at its request. That conditionality was neither considered nor agreed to in paragraph 98 of the outcome document. Implicitly, this would limit the capacity of the other principal organs and actors to address peacebuilding activities in post-conflict situations.

Paragraph 12 (c) states that the Organizational Committee shall establish the agenda of the Commission based on requests for advice from Member States in exceptional circumstances on the verge of lapsing or relapsing into conflict and which are not on the agenda of the Security Council. Similarly, paragraph 12 (b) states that it will do so based on:

> "Requests for advice from the Economic and Social Council or the General Assembly with the consent of a concerned Member State in exceptional circumstances on the verge of lapsing or relapsing into conflict and with which the Security Council is not seized in accordance with Article 12 of the Charter".

Adherence to the condition that the Member State not be on the agenda of the Security Council would be the sine qua non for seeking the Peacebuilding Commission's advice. However, peacebuilding activities should not have to wait until a State is no longer on the agenda of the Security Council. Rather, post-conflict recovery, including reconstruction and institution-building efforts, need to commence once a post-conflict situation has been stabilized. Limiting the possibilities of seeking the Commission's advice will, in effect, discourage Member States from approaching the Peacebuilding Commission.

A resolution has been adopted by the Security Council which will place all its permanent members on the Organizational Committee automatically (Security Council resolution 1646 (2005)). That is the cascade effect with a vengeance. After being told that only identical draft resolutions would be introduced, we now learn that an additional draft resolution was placed before the Security Council. That says a great deal about the role of the non-permanent members, the nature of the Security Council and the working methods of the Security Council. In effect, through the addition of a simple subparagraph (d), the resolution would have the effect, actually, of superseding the resolution of the General Assembly, with clear implications for the revitalization of this chief deliberative organ of the United Nations — though, undoubtedly, it would do so under the camouflage of legality.

Therefore, in combination with the conditionality on its main purposes and the limit on who can seek advice, the Peacebuilding Commission will be reduced to a body that was certainly not envisaged in exactly this form in the outcome document. We had hoped that the operationalization of the Peacebuilding Commission would help real reform and give the General Assembly a revitalized role. We still hope, however, that the Peacebuilding Commission, in its actual workings, will begin to render concrete assistance in conflict and post-conflict situations.

By adopting the resolution, we hope that we have at least adhered to the specific time line our leaders asked us to meet and to the other deadlines that have been authoritatively suggested on other reform processes.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): This is the first major decision that we have taken in the follow-up to the decisions of our leaders at the 2005 summit. Yes, we have been able to respect the time lines that were indicated by our leaders to operationalize the Peacebuilding Commission by the end of the year.

Pakistan attaches great importance to that decision, given the fact that the concept of the three principal organs and of all relevant actors involved in

post-conflict situations acting together was first proposed by Pakistan in the Security Council in the form of our proposal for ad hoc composite committees. We are very grateful to you, Sir, and to the two co-Chairs, who have worked very hard on developing the resolution. We have tried, through the negotiations and in informal consultations, to make our contribution to the evolution of the decision.

We have accepted the resolution because it has been adopted on the basis of consensus and we believe that the principle of consensus must be applied to all the decisions to be taken on the reform exercise. Indeed, we have several difficulties with the provisions of the text that has been adopted, and I would like to take this opportunity to clarify our position with regard to some important aspects of the resolution.

First, as regards the establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission, we continue to maintain that the summit had already established the Commission. We therefore interpret operative paragraph 1, which provides for a decision to act concurrently with the Security Council, as being designed only to operationalize the Peacebuilding Commission, rather than to establish it. We believe that that is an important, if technical differentiation.

Secondly, we continue to maintain that the roles and interaction of the principal organs of the United Nations — the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council — must be equitable, balanced and simultaneous. Each post-conflict situation has security dimensions, peace dimensions and development dimensions, and each organ and agency of the United Nations that has a role to play must be enabled to play that role in an equitable and full manner, rather than be constrained or constricted by the jurisdictions established by, for example, the Security Council. Indeed, it is only such common action that is the value addition that will be provided by the Peacebuilding Commission. If the Security Council or any other principal organ were to establish exclusive jurisdiction over the activities of that body, the Commission would, in our view, be superfluous. It is only by acting together that we can develop the synergies of the entire system to advance the goal of post-conflict reconstruction and peace. We therefore believe that there is tension between paragraph 16 of the resolution and the rest of its provisions — paragraphs 13 and 14 in particular — as well as the spirit and the letter of the summit decision.

Thirdly, with regard to the composition of the Organizational Committee, we had started from the presumption that it would be functional in nature and would therefore include membership from the Security Council. However, that would include permanent and non-permanent members. It would also include membership from the Economic and Social Council to bring in the development dimension, and it would include representation of the top troop- and fund-contributing countries. In response to the concerns of some of our colleagues with regard to the possibility of regional underrepresentation, we have agreed to the inclusion of membership from the General Assembly as well in order to balance functional representation with equitable regional representation.

Furthermore, I must state with all possible vehemence that we have consistently argued against permanent membership of the Peacebuilding Commission and, indeed, of any other organ of the United Nations. We have been made aware, however, of the actions that have been taken in the Security Council, where the additional resolution (Security Council resolution 1646 (2005)) clearly contradicts the spirit of the resolution which we have adopted in the General Assembly and provides for permanent membership of the five permanent members of the Security Council. We consider that this development, at the very outset of the operationalization of the Peacebuilding Commission, is a most unfortunate one.

But if there is an insistence on the part of the five permanent members on their permanent representation in the Organizational Committee of the Peacebuilding Commission, I would submit that other countries which contribute in other ways — for example, by putting the lives of their sons and daughters in harm's way by providing troops for United Nations peacekeeping — perhaps deserve equal treatment with the permanent members of the Security Council.

In any case, we would urge you, Mr. President, to reconcile the spirit of this resolution with the actions just taken by the Security Council so that we can start our work on the Commission on the right foot and not distort the important consensus decision that we have adopted in this Hall today.

Mr. Berruga (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): Mexico recognizes the fundamental importance of establishing the Peacebuilding Commission as soon as possible. It is particularly important for countries

emerging from conflict situations, which need that support from the international community as they move towards the consolidation of a lasting and sustainable peace. Our heads of State or Government pledged to make the Commission operational by the end of the year, and it is our duty to fulfil that commitment.

I wish to thank you, Mr. President, and the co-Chairs of the consultation process, the Permanent Representatives of Denmark and Tanzania, for your constant efforts to bring the process to a successful conclusion. The outcome reflects your commitment to the Commission and, even more important, the relevance and the central role of the General Assembly.

Like other delegations, including several from the Latin American and Caribbean region, we emphasized during the consultations how important it is that the Organizational Committee not become an organ of fixed composition. Rather, its members should serve by rotation, and all regions of the world should be represented on it in a balanced manner.

During the consultation process, we supported the principle by which the General Assembly would select the members of two categories of Committee members — the top financial providers and the top providers of troops and civilian police — from a pool of contributors that was broader than the one ultimately set out in the resolution. We believe that limiting the list to 10 contributors is not practical because it will inhibit cooperation. Nor does it make sense from a political perspective.

It is our understanding that the General Assembly's selection of seven additional members of the Committee constitutes a geographical compensation mechanism for those regions that are excluded or underrepresented in the overall composition of the Committee.

Nonetheless, we regret that the Secretariat was not able to compile the list of the top financial providers which numerous delegations requested during the consultations. We trust that the Secretariat will manage to prepare that list in time for the selection of the members of the Organizational Committee, because it is vital that the process be transparent.

Finally, my delegation notes, as has already been noted, that there is a significant discrepancy between the English version and the Spanish version of the resolution.

Beyond the question of translation, permanent members of the Security Council should not feel that they have an obligation to be members of the Organizational Committee. The cascade effect should not be automatic or be interpreted as a precedent on the basis of the resolution adopted today.

In addition to those clarifications, we express our hope that the new Peacebuilding Commission will be successful and benefit the international community, in particular those States that have suffered conflict in recent years.

Mr. Maurer (Switzerland) (*spoke in French*): Switzerland welcomes the adoption of resolution 60/180, on the Peacebuilding Commission, which marks a milestone in the implementation of decisions taken by our heads of State or Government at the 2005 world summit.

Following the end of a conflict, the principal actors in the fields of peacekeeping, humanitarian assistance and development must work together to rebuild a country. Those various actors, including institutions, States and civil society organizations, often carry out their work concurrently. That is why Switzerland has always supported a model that balances the interests of security and development. The sequential model chosen does not correspond to that reality. Unfortunately, its perspectives are limited.

Numerous Member States have expressed similar reservations with respect to the overly central role of the Security Council. Thus, we regret that paragraph 16 gives such great importance to the Council and that the Peacebuilding Commission can be consulted by the Economic and Social Council only at a later stage.

Another ongoing concern of Switzerland has been to ensure the most active representation possible of the countries that contribute most to peacebuilding activities, including through voluntary contributions to agencies, funds and programmes. The resolution adopted today is more exclusive than inclusive. For that reason, Switzerland interprets paragraphs 4 (c) and 4 (d) to mean that the list of the 10 contributors is to be established excluding countries that are already members of the Committee in their capacity as members of the Security Council or of the Economic and Social Council.

Today we have succeeded in filling an institutional gap. The challenge of combining security

and development has yet to be met. Switzerland has joined the consensus today in order to give a chance to reform and to the United Nations role in peacebuilding. It will be the responsibility of the Commission towards all Members States to ensure that its work is truly participatory and takes a development perspective into account in peacebuilding situations. Only when the Commission begins its work will we know whether the decision that we have just taken warrants being considered historic.

Mr. **Malmierca Díaz** (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Cuba understands the importance of providing disinterested assistance and cooperation to countries emerging from internal armed conflict. At the same time, we believe that it is crucial to deal with the root causes of those conflicts in a timely manner.

My delegation decided to join the consensus on draft resolution A/60/L.40 in order not to hinder the establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission by 31 December 2005.

Essentially, we have taken into account the interest expressed in the Peacebuilding Commission by the brotherly countries of Africa, whose peoples have suffered first-hand the scourge of armed conflict, in many cases fomented by the voracious greed of multinational corporations and by Powers with imperialist designs for domination.

Nevertheless, my delegation remains concerned about some of the wording of the resolution. In the interests of brevity, I shall confine myself here to clearly expressing our profound dissatisfaction with the second preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1.

With regard to the second preambular paragraph, I wish to make it clear that the specific reservations expressed by Cuba in explanation of position when the outcome document was adopted by the General Assembly on 13 September remain valid. Our comments were based on the inadequacies and weaknesses of the document and its controversial provisions, which respond only to the interests of a small number of countries. In that regard, I wish to assert very clearly that the flexibility displayed today by our delegation in no way prejudges the position that Cuba will take in future negotiations in which any attempt might be made to echo the language of the second preambular paragraph.

With respect to operative paragraph 1, we reiterate our concern about its ambiguity, arising out of the establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission by two principal organs of the United Nations, the General Assembly and the Security Council. The Cuban delegation continues to believe that the Peacebuilding Commission should have been established solely by the General Assembly, in which all States Members of the United Nations are represented, and that it should report exclusively to the Assembly. We do not deny the role that the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council might play in the Commission, within their respective mandates as established by the Charter.

It is our hope that the duality in which the Peacebuilding Commission will begin its work will not lead to the Security Council's becoming its guiding body. It is now up to the Members of the United Nations to ensure that that not occur and to take all necessary action in that regard.

Lastly, we recall that the United Nations is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members. In that context, we strongly urge that this principle be preserved and be kept firmly in mind in the current process of United Nations institutional reform.

Mr. **Maleki** (Islamic Republic of Iran): I thank you, Sir, and the two co-Chairs, Ambassador Loj of Denmark and Ambassador Mahiga of Tanzania, for holding several meetings to allow us to express our views on the issue of the Peacebuilding Commission.

My delegation joined the consensus on resolution 60/180, just adopted under agenda items 46 and 120, to operationalize the decision taken at the 2005 world summit to establish the Peacebuilding Commission as an intergovernmental advisory body. We did so in the following understanding.

First, the Peacebuilding Commission will be guided by the General Assembly in its work, functions, mandates and review process.

Second, the Commission's mandate is to assist countries emerging from conflict towards recovery and to prevent them from relapsing into conflict.

Third, in the country-specific situation, the work of the Commission will be activated by a formal request from the national Government of the country concerned, and the national ownership of the whole peacebuilding processed is ensured.

Fourth, the Peacebuilding Commission should deal with economic and reconstruction activities in post-conflict situations and therefore should not address pre-conflict situations, including conflict resolution.

Fifth, the Organizational Committee of the Commission establishes the agenda of the Commission based on requests for advice from relevant bodies — the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and the Security Council — with the consent of the concerned Member State.

Sixth, there will be no permanent membership of the Peacebuilding Commission.

Seventh, we emphasize that the principles of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of States and non-intervention in matters that are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State are crucial and shall be strictly observed in the post-conflict peacebuilding process, as well as in all the work of the Peacebuilding Commission insofar as the country-specific situation is concerned.

Mrs. Miller (Jamaica): My delegation would like to compliment you, Sir, on the work you have done in elaborating the compromise text placed before us. The text has many positive elements.

We would also like to commend and thank the co-Chairs, the Permanent Representatives of Denmark and Tanzania, for their work.

The delegation of Jamaica has gone along with the consensus on resolution 60/180 on the Peacebuilding Commission, as we are committed to the objectives and purposes of the Commission. We view the Peacebuilding Commission as an important instrument in promoting a coherent and coordinated approach to the sustainable development, reconstruction and rehabilitation of countries emerging from conflict, thereby leading to the strengthening of peace and security in those countries. Many of those are African countries, and we support all efforts within the international system to strengthen peace, stability and economic reconstruction among them.

During previous consultations on the modalities to govern the Commission, Jamaica expressed the view that great care should be exercised in preserving the central role of the General Assembly, in keeping with the principles of the Charter and, in particular, Article 10. While we acknowledge that the General Assembly has been given a role in reporting responsibilities and in the membership of the Organizational Committee, we are concerned that the resolution has given too much of a predominant role to the Security Council in the operation of the Peacebuilding Commission, particularly in terms of oversight and mandate responsibilities. Such responsibilities should properly have been the sole purview of the General Assembly, thus strengthening its central position in the Organization.

For those reasons, we have reservations on operative paragraph 1, which provides for the Security Council to act concurrently with the General Assembly in operationalizing the Commission. That undermines the pre-eminence of the General Assembly within the system established under the Charter.

We have similar reservations on operative paragraph 27, as we believe that the review process should be conducted only in the General Assembly. We also have reservations on operative paragraph 16, which we view as restrictive. Such advice should also be given to the Economic and Social Council, given the critical role it will be expected to play in post-conflict situations.

We are also concerned that the process of selection on the Organizational Committee, as outlined in operative paragraph 4 (a), discriminates among the various categories, allowing for some to be selected while others are elected.

The language in operative paragraph 6 suggests that there will be the possibility of permanent membership on the Commission. Jamaica is not in favour of any permanent membership on the Commission, and we are also disappointed that there seems to be an assumption that membership on the Commission should be a prerogative of the permanent members of the Security Council in accordance with operative paragraph 4 (a).

Finally, Jamaica supports the early operationalization of the Commission. In that context, we call for the requisite funding to be made quickly available to the Commission. This also includes the funding for the proposed peacebuilding support office.

Mr. Yáñez-Barnuevo (Spain) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like first to express support for the statement made by the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom on behalf of the European Union.

I express my delegation's sincere appreciation for the tireless efforts that you, Sir, have made as President, with the effective cooperation of the Permanent Representatives of Denmark and the United Republic of Tanzania in their capacity as co-Chairs of the informal consultations of the General Assembly on the establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission. Thanks to these efforts, the Assembly's endeavours have yielded fruit within the time frame set out in September's 2005 World Summit Outcome (*resolution 60/1*).

Together with the rest of the European Union, Spain has been supporting with determination the establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission by the end of this year, because we believe that its prompt operationalization will contribute decisively to ensuring coordinated and effective action by the international community in the complex and delicate context of the post-conflict stage, when the risk of reactivation of confrontation remains.

It was necessary to have a dedicated institutional mechanism to meet the particular needs of countries emerging from conflict situations. By adopting this resolution with a very high degree of consensus, a vital step forward has been taken in the process of reforming the Organization. My delegation welcomes this, and we intend to contribute actively to the work of the Commission that we have just concretely established.

I would like to make a few comments on the resolution we have just adopted. Apart from supporting comments made about the Spanish version of A/60/L.40, I would like to emphasize certain aspects that are of particular importance to my delegation. I am referring in particular to the composition of the Commission's Organizational Committee, as reflected in operative paragraph 4 of the resolution. It is indeed our understanding that it is fundamental to ensure well-balanced renewal and rotation among members of the Organizational Committee, so that all countries capable of making a valuable contribution to its work can truly be enabled to do so. That is why my delegation supports your words, Mr. President, when you introduced the draft resolution this morning and referred to the need to periodically update the list of countries that are the top financial and troop providers. This will undoubtedly be a constant incentive for national support for the efforts of the United Nations.

We also want to underscore the importance of paragraph 27, which provides that the provisions contained in the resolution will be reviewed five years after the adoption of the resolution to ensure that they remain appropriate, to fulfil the functions of the Commission.

In short, with the establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission, the role of the United Nations in reconstruction, recovery and development of countries emerging from conflict situations will be strengthened. This is undoubtedly good news for the international community as a whole, and particularly for all peoples greatly in need of our attention and our sustained support, particularly in Africa and in other parts of the developing world.

Mr. Løvald (Norway): We have strengthened the United Nations today through the decision taken on the Peacebuilding Commission. But, equally important, we are now better placed to deal with complex post-conflict situations.

Mr. President, Norway would like to thank you and the co-Chairs of the informal consultations, the Permanent Representatives of Denmark and the United Republic of Tanzania, for the excellent work you have done in order to bring us to a conclusion regarding the Peacebuilding Commission and for the patient, open, transparent and inclusive manner in which you have conducted the consultations. During the consultations, we stressed the need to give the Peacebuilding Commission the flexibility it needs to act efficiently, and we believe the resolution we have just adopted lays a good foundation for its work.

Norway was, therefore, pleased to join in the adoption of the resolution and intends to be truly committed to the work of the Peacebuilding Commission. We have pointed out on many occasions that the Peacebuilding Commission will be measured by its capacity to deliver, and that one of the main tasks of the Organizational Committee will be to rally resources not only for the peacebuilding fund but also for countries in transition on a broad basis. In this regard, I am happy to confirm that the Norwegian Government intends to contribute a total of $30 million to the peacebuilding fund.

Finally, I would hope that today's action by the General Assembly will pave the way for similar action within the next few days on other pressing issues as

well, including budget issues, management reform and the Human Rights Council.

The President: I thank the representative of Norway for the planned Norwegian contribution to the peacebuilding fund.

Mr. Sardenberg (Brazil): Brazil joined in the adoption of resolution 60/180 on the implementation of the decision on the Peacebuilding Commission. We did so based on the need to fill the institutional gap for coordinating activities in the economic and social spheres required to consolidate and sustain peace in post-conflict situations, as well as to help prevent situations leading to countries lapsing or relapsing into conflict.

The Peacebuilding Commission should generate greater coordination among United Nations organs and actors, as well as between them and the international financial institutions, to the benefit of more focused and effective peacebuilding activities.

Brazil is convinced that there will be no long-term peace in any country as long as the root causes of conflict are not tackled and effective action towards sustainable development is not taken. Time and again in the General Assembly, as well as in the Security Council, Brazil has highlighted the importance of expanding the concept of security to include measures for the improvement of health and education and for fighting against poverty, hunger and unemployment. To a large extent, peacebuilding activities should run parallel to peacekeeping. We remain committed to that view, and we will work towards its full realization.

Two elements of the present resolution, however, were not, in our view, adequately resolved in the consultations that were held. The interaction between the Peacebuilding Commission and the main organs of the United Nations, and the efforts foreseen for the composition of the Organizational Committee.

On those two issues, the final version of the text fell short of the expectations of a very significant number of Member States, including my own. The text on those issues raises serious questions.

First, the interaction of the Peacebuilding Commission with the principal United Nations organs is unbalanced, as too much weight is placed on the role of the Security Council. There can be no doubt that the Security Council has primary responsibility on questions of peace and security, as established in the Charter. However, when peacebuilding activities come into play, a greater role should have been foreseen for the Economic and Social Council, especially if we envisage a reformed standing Council, such as Brazil and many other countries are striving for.

Secondly, as regards the composition of the Organizational Committee of the Peacebuilding Commission, two main principles governing membership in United Nations organs — participation through elections and the assurance of equitable geographical distribution — have not been fully reflected. A truly representative and legitimate body must be based on the observance of those principles. It is indeed unsettling that, in creating a new organ, the membership was left with little choice but to accept a system of selection for certain categories by and from a list of few.

As to the question of geographical balance, Brazil considers the category established in operative paragraph 4 (e) as serving the purpose of correcting geographical imbalances that will inevitably result from the process of the selection of members in other categories. The sub-item (e) category must be filled in such a way as to allow for the Organizational Committee to observe the principle of geographical balance in its overall composition.

In conclusion, I would like to express my concern over the possible difficulties that may lie ahead in the implementation of the resolution by the General Assembly. The system chosen for determining the composition of the Organizational Committee offers opportunities and assurances of representation for a small and predictable group of countries, while others do not have such assurances. It is foreseeable that such a system will have a bearing on the work of the Peacebuilding Commission itself.

Despite the text's serious shortcomings, Brazil nevertheless decided to join in its adoption. We did so in the firm belief that the Peacebuilding Commission is a long-standing goal of developing countries, which suffer the most in conflict situations and are in great need of effective post-conflict recovery activities. Developing countries are those that will enjoy the greatest benefits from the advice of the Peacebuilding Commission. The position we have just taken in this Hall is in support of those aspirations.

Mr. Dauth (Australia): I am honoured, of course, once again to speak for Canada and New Zealand, as well as my own country, Australia.

Let me say immediately, Sir, how much our countries warmly welcome the adoption of resolution 60/180 this morning, establishing the modalities of the Peacebuilding Commission. Let me also express my disappointment, frankly, with a lot of the tone of the discussion this morning, which is altogether far less enthusiastic than it ought to be, and far less enthusiastic, in our view, than this important moment warrants. We have lived up to our leaders' expectation by adopting the resolution before 31 December, and Canada, New Zealand and Australia hope — as I know you do too, Sir — that we can all harness the momentum to implement the full reform agenda in a timely manner.

We particularly want to thank not just you and your office, Sir, but the two magnificent co-Chairs of the informal consultations — Ellen Løj and Augustine Mahiga — for their leadership and tireless work. They have truly covered themselves in glory, unlike, I regret to observe, some of the rest of us, who have too often allowed differences to define the tone of the debate. We have seen too much of that today. Canada, New Zealand and Australia do not believe that the carping interventions of which we have heard too much today reflect the enthusiasm of the overwhelming majority of this Assembly, not to mention the importance which our publics and civil societies attach to this immensely important measure.

We think that, for example, Ambassadors Løj and Mahiga did an extraordinary job striking a compromise on the most difficult issue — the membership of the Organizational Committee. At the same time, we just want to remind States that the Organizational Committee will be an essentially administrative body. Its role should not be overstated or expanded. All of that has been the subject of much comment this morning.

The real work of the Peacebuilding Commission will be done in country-specific meetings. We will see how the Commission unfolds and we will judge it as it unfolds. We look forward to it beginning its valuable work as soon as possible and we thank and once again congratulate you, Sir, and Ambassadors Løj and Mahiga on a job outstandingly well done.

Mr. Azor (Haiti) (*spoke in French*): The Haitian delegation has joined the consensus. The adoption of resolution 60/180 represents a success for the international community. It translates into reality the will expressed by our leaders in the outcome document of the September summit. Today's historic consensus is an essential step in the Organization's reform process.

In that regard, we commend the Secretary-General's initiative and welcome the tireless efforts of the President of the General Assembly and of the two co-Chairs of the informal consultations during the intense negotiations that led to the establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission.

The Peacebuilding Commission is mandated and designed to fill a major institutional gap in our Organization. Past experience has highlighted the difficulties encountered by the international community in the transition from war to lasting peace in States that have suffered conflicts. As an intergovernmental advisory body, the Commission is called upon to emphasize the need for a coordinated, coherent and integrated approach to post-conflict peacebuilding with a view to restoring durable peace, meeting the special needs of countries emerging from conflict, supporting their recovery, reintegration and reconstruction efforts, and helping them lay the groundwork for sustainable development and political stability.

Now, we must identify the deep-rooted causes of resurgent conflicts and devise lasting solutions in order to set the stage for durable socio-economic development. It is precisely in situations of abject poverty and of the dire shortage of material resources suffered by most of our peoples that we can often identify the deepest causes of conflict.

The international community has come to understand the profoundly social nature of crises. In that regard, we must especially stress the important role to be played by the international financial institutes that seek to implement general poverty-reduction strategies. Such strategies must ensure the essential link between the activities of national authorities, the support of donors, and efforts to achieve the Millennium Development Goal of halving poverty by 2015. It is also urgent to establish a multi-year peacebuilding fund with a view to making the resources necessary for peacebuilding activities

available forthwith and in adequate amounts for recovery operations.

There can be no doubt that the involvement of all relevant parties will lead to the Peacebuilding Commission's success. Its participatory and inclusive nature is essential to ensuring the involvement of regional and local actors in its work. All delegations agree on the fact that national ownership in the Commission's work is crucial. It has been demonstrated that a lack of understanding of events on the ground delays or effectively prevents lasting solutions to conflicts and contributes to the failure of some development projects in our States.

My delegation's expectations are enormous. The forthcoming elections in my country will soon choose new leaders who will bear the onerous responsibility of addressing socio-economic problems in conditions akin to those in a post-conflict situation. They will, of course, be working with the international community. Haiti's interests are therefore obvious in this matter, and Haiti could be the first test case for this process. Haitian authorities are already expressing their desire to participate actively in the Peacebuilding Commission's work, which should focus on socio-economic development and on strengthening failing democratic institutions.

Our delegation remains convinced that, given its mission, the Peacebuilding Commission will lend new impetus to the quest for peace through major coordination in the socio-economic affairs of countries emerging from conflict, with the direct participation of all actors involved in peacebuilding. The United Nations can thereby prevent the resurgence of crises, avoid the deployment of a number of peacekeeping operations, and divert the financial resources that would have been spent thereon to sustainable development.

Mr. Oshima (Japan): The delegation of Japan appreciated your introduction, Sir, of the resolution on the establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission to the Assembly for adoption today.

Since January, my delegation has presented some specific proposals to contribute to the discussion of that important issue. We have noted that the text you presented represented the best efforts on the part of the co-Chairs, as well as on your own part, to arrive at a broadly acceptable compromise on the key issues involved. I should like to take this opportunity to sincerely thank you, Sir, and the co-Chairs, Ambassador Løj and Ambassador Mahiga, for all your strenuous and valuable efforts.

We are less than fully satisfied with the text of the resolution, for example with regard to the composition of the Organizational Committee. However, we joined the consensus in a spirit of compromise and also in the hope that the resolution — which you, Sir, appropriately described as a groundbreaking achievement — will contribute to facilitating the resolution of other important issues pending before us. We should seize on the momentum created by the adoption of the resolution and the spirit of compromise demonstrated here to accelerate discussions on other important proposals for United Nations reform.

Once again, I wish to congratulate you, Sir, on this momentous achievement by the General Assembly under your guidance. Japan looks forward to playing an active, strong and consistent role in the Peacebuilding Commission.

Mr. Kumalo (South Africa): At the end of the day, the Peacebuilding Commission will be judged on how much difference it makes to the lives of the people in Burundi, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia and other places in Africa. That will really be the judge.

We are pleased that we finally have the Peacebuilding Commission. However, we have just two disappoints that we need to place on record. First, we are concerned that there are indications that the Secretariat will not be able to staff the peacebuilding support office from existing resources. While we welcome such support as that announced by Norway today, we still believe that, if Member States are really serious about the Peacebuilding Commission, it must be funded from the resources of the Organization.

Secondly, South Africa has been among those countries that have always argued that, if the Peacebuilding Commission is to be successful, it requires permanent and non-permanent members of the Security Council to be involved. Thus, the additional decision of the Security Council's permanent members to make themselves permanent in the Peacebuilding Commission as well came as a big surprise to us and goes against the spirit of what we supported and fought for throughout the process.

However, as I said, in the end it does not matter what we do or say here. It does not matter what games we play here. In the end, it is the difference in the lives of the people on the ground in Guinea-Bissau, Burundi, Liberia and elsewhere that will be judged.

Mr. Idoko (Nigeria): I wish to congratulate you, Sir, on the adoption of the resolution on the Peacebuilding Commission. Above all, I wish to pay a very warm tribute to the co-Chairs, the Permanent Representatives of Denmark and Tanzania, for their dedication, hard work and patience. The co-Chairs facilitated the consultations with the utmost transparency and fairness. The document that we have just adopted without a vote is a testimony to the co-Chairs' ability in handling the varying positions expressed by delegations in the course of the numerous consultations held.

The adoption of the resolution without a vote shows the level of understanding and the favourable disposition of Member States towards the establishment and operationalization of the Commission. That disposition was evident right from the start of the negotiations that preceded the high-level summit. It also shows that we have indeed kept faith with the desires of our leaders.

Nigeria expresses satisfaction with the document just adopted. The Commission represents another bold step by the international community to contribute to the efforts of the African continent to find lasting solutions to numerous conflict situations there.

The challenge before us now is how to make the Commission effective through adequate funding. It may be recalled that in earlier statements we emphasized that important fact that, without adequate funding, the Commission will come to nothing. In this context, we wish to salute Norway for promptly responding to the call. I would also like to take this opportunity to call on other members to promptly contribute to the peacebuilding fund.

I would also like to assure you, Mr. President, and the entire membership, of Nigeria's willingness and readiness to play a leading and active role in the effective functioning of the peacebuilding fund. I would also like to thank members, on behalf of Africa, for the understanding that they have shown in adopting the draft resolution promptly and without a vote.

Mrs. Gallardo Hernández (El Salvador) (*spoke in Spanish*): The delegation of El Salvador would like to express its appreciation for what it considers to be significant work carried out by the sponsors of resolution 60/180. The General Assembly has reached consensus, and we believe that this is a historic moment. In our view, the creation and operationalization of the Peacebuilding Commission fulfils the mandate entrusted to us by our heads of State or Government in September.

The objective of the Commission, as we understand it, is to help peoples in conflict situations to overcome their difficulties. We hope that, to that end, the Commission will base itself on the experience of countries that have moved from political agreements to the establishment of lasting foundations for development and good governance.

As has already been said, it is essential that populations that have experienced conflict have at their disposal a new structure, within the United Nations system, that can fill the gaps in support, prevention and the coordination of activities on the ground, so that they can move from peace towards development.

A number of countries, including El Salvador, have called for the participation in the Organizational Committee of countries that can share their post-conflict experiences. We believe that we must contribute by taking a positive, well-founded, historic approach to the operations of the United Nations system as a whole with a view to identifying the sources of conflict and to managing the transition of countries in conflict.

We also welcome the inclusion of the gender perspective. As Security Council resolution 1325 (2000), on women and peace and security, recalls, women have an important role to play in post-conflict situations.

We assure the Assembly that El Salvador would like, along with other countries, to make a contribution to the work of the Commission and to share with the international community our own historic experience and accomplishments, as well as to recall our times of difficulty.

The President: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of position.

I would now like to say a few words. It is not possible for me to respond in detail to all of the

questions and comments. They are extremely valuable, and I consider them to be important from the point of view of principle — as several speakers have said — as well as of considerable practical significance.

I would like to thank members for the support that they have given to the co-Chairs of the informal consultations and to me. We have had a difficult job to do and hard choices to make. I am glad that we have taken a decision respecting our leaders' time line. I hope that we will see the Peacebuilding Commission as an expression of the basic concept of the three organs — the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council — working closely together. If we do it right, that could lead to better coordination and could fill the institutional gap that all of us, including our leaders, have recognized.

As President of the General Assembly, I am, of course, particularly sensitive to the comments made regarding the standing and the role of the General Assembly. We all need to think more deeply about those issues. But that is, indeed, a consequence of the fact that we are breaking new ground by establishing the relationship between the different groups, and that we are, indeed, now trying to live up to the basic concept of the outcome document, namely, that development must occur, but that without security there can be no development and without development there can be no security — and, by the way, that there will be neither without respect for human rights.

All of that comes together in the search for a new method of work that we are now elaborating in the United Nations. For me, it is also a very basic requirement that we live up to the Charter. Voices have been raised here relating to basic issues — for instance, respect for sovereignty — which I do not think should ever be questioned. I think that we should always remind ourselves of that very important document, which underlies all of our work, and which we should confirm and reconfirm as much as possible. I hope that the Peacebuilding Commission too will be working in that spirit; I am sure that it will.

As the Secretary-General said and as the representative of South Africa underlined, this is the beginning of the life of the Peacebuilding Commission. Much work remains, and we will be guided by the comments made here at this important moment.

There are some practical things that need to be done. I am requesting the Secretary-General to provide us with a list of the top 10 contributors of assessed and voluntary contributions and, of course, to update the list of contributors of military personnel and civilian police. I hope that that work will be finalized as soon as possible. I also call on the relevant organs and groups to expeditiously select or elect their members for the Organizational Committee so that the Secretary-General can convene the first meeting of the Committee as soon as possible.

I think that we should remember — and I think that the interventions from our colleagues and friends from Africa and from Haiti showed — that it is on the ground where success will be measured. That is the difference that the Commission will make to the people around the world who are suffering. That means that we must continue to set up the Peacebuilding Commission, make it a living reality and fund it accordingly. If we are to make it work well, we must let it work on the basis of a harmonious relationship between the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council — a body that is about to be revitalized by the work that we are continuing here.

Finally, I want members to see this as part of the general reform effort. Much work remains to be done. I think it was important for all of us to take this step today. And I hope it will be inspiring for the work on continued reform, even if serious questions are raised.

The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of items 46 and 120.

Programme of work

The President: Before adjourning the meeting, I would like to inform members that on the morning of Thursday, 22 December 2005, the General Assembly will take action on draft resolution A/60/L.43, under agenda item 45, "Follow-up to the outcome of the twenty-sixth special session: implementation of the Declaration of Commitment on HIV/AIDS", as the first item on the agenda. The Assembly will then consider the reports of the Second Committee.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.